

REMARKS

The amendment of claims 1 and 23 is supported by paragraph [0008] and Figure 1 of the specification. Claim 24 is supported by paragraph [0009] of the specification.

The undersigned thanks the Examiner for the courtesies extended to the undersigned during the in-person interview of June 13, 2007. The Interview Summary states, "Discussed the possible claim amendments. The examiner will evaluate the amendments when they are officially filed." During the interview, the Examiner reviewed the present invention in light of MacLeod and FR '643. The Examiner said that both MacLeod and FR '643 do not appear to disclose the following features:

- (a) the position of the anode contact relative to the workpiece;
- (b) the position of the clamping ring relative to the electrode assembly; and
- (c) an electrolyte passage through the base.

Claim Rejection - 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-10, 16-17 and 19-23 were rejected as being obvious over MacLeod in view of FR '643. This rejection is respectively traversed.

Claims 1 and 16 have been amended to recite (a) the position of the anode contact relative to the workpiece; and (b) the position of the clamping ring relative to the electrode assembly. Claim 23 recites that the electrolyte passage through the base. Also, claim 24 recites that the expandable diaphragm comprises a flange portion, a wall and a foot; the expandable diaphragm being attached to the base such that a seal forms between the wall and the locating area. None of these features are disclosed in either MacLeod or FR '643.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: June 25, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By /Raj S. Davé/
Raj S. Davé
Registration No.: 42,465
DARBY & DARBY P.C.
P.O. Box 770
Church Street Station
New York, New York 10008-0770
(202) 639-7515
(212) 527-7701 (Fax)
Attorneys/Agents For Applicant